

REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 7, 2004 contained a final rejection of claims 1-32. The Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 23, 27 and 30. Claims 1-32 remain in the case. Please consider the present amendment with the attached Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. This amendment is in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-16 and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,454) in view of Patterson (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,670). Also, claims 4-5, 10-11, 17 and 23-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,454) in view of Patterson (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,670) and Mitsuya (JP-411312068A).

The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

Currently amended claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 23, 27 and 30 include creating a history record that includes a chain of delivery events occurring after sending the e-media and interaction events occurring after receipt of the e-media and sending the history record to the client/receiving party. Also, independent claims 7, 13 and 27 include sending to the sender/user the history record and regular status updates on availability times of the client/receiving party to receive new e-media based on the events of the history record. Next, independent claims 23 and 27 include sending the history record to **both** the sender/user and the client/receiving party.

In contrast, with regard to claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-16 and 18-22, Wang et al. in combination with Patterson do **not** disclose all of the Applicant's elements of the currently amended claims. In addition, with regard to claims 4-5, 10-11, 17 and 23-32, Wang et al. in combination with Patterson and Mitsuya do **not** disclose all of the Applicant's elements of the currently amended claims.

Specifically, among other things, **none** of cited references, in combination or alone, disclose the Applicant's creating a history record that includes a chain of delivery events and sending the history record to the client/receiving party. Instead, Wang et al. disclose notifying a sending account whether a message sent to the receiving account was read or deleted, while Mitsuya simply disclose returning validity/invalidity of printing

of the electronic mail. Although Patterson discloses sending notification information triggered by an event, the combined references are still missing the Applicant's claimed creating a history record and sending the history record to the client/receiving party.

Further, with regard to claims 7, 13, 27 and 30, none of cited references, in combination or alone, disclose the Applicant's sending to the sender/user the history record and regular status updates on availability times of the client/receiving party to receive new e-media based on the events of the history record. Last, with regard to claims 23 and 27, none of cited references, in combination or alone, disclose the Applicant's sending the history record to both the sender/user and the client/receiving party. Therefore, with regard to the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-16 and 18-22 (using the combination of Wang et al. with Patterson) and claims 4-5, 10-11, 17 and 23-32 (using Wang et al. in combination with Patterson and Mitsuya), the combined references respectively are missing elements of the Applicant's claims, and thus, they cannot render the claims obvious in either rejection.

With regard to the dependent claims, because they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, and they contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, these claims are also considered to be patentable (MPEP § 2143.03).

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney at (818) 885-1575. Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to:

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: October 7, 2004



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicants
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX